

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re: Application of:	:
Abdelhadi et al.	:
	: Before the Examiner:
Serial No: 09/965,002	: Michael D. Meucci
	:
Filed: 09/27/2001	: Group Art Unit: 2142
	:
Title: APPARATUS AND METHOD	: Confirmation No.: 2728
OF REPRESENTING REAL-TIME	:
DISTRIBUTED COMMAND	:
EXECUTION STATUS ACROSS	:
DISTRIBUTED SYSTEMS	:

RESPONSE TO NOTICE OF NON-COMPLIANT APPEAL BRIEF

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This is a Response to a Notice of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief dated
December 08, 2008.

BRIEF FOR APPLICANTS - APPELLANTS

(i)

Real Party in Interest

The real party in interest is International Business Machines Corporation (IBM), the assignee.

(ii)

Related Appeals and Interferences

There are no other appeals or interferences known to appellants, appellants' representative or assignee, which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(iii)

Status of Claims

Claims 1 - 37 have been finally rejected. Claims 1 – 37 are being appealed.

(iv)

Status of Amendment

An "Amendment-After-Final" was not filed.

(v)

Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The invention, as claimed in Claim 1, provides a method of displaying an execution status of a command that is sent to a plurality of computer systems on a network for execution. The method comprises the steps of: displaying a dialog window (page 17, lines 9 - 16 and execution progress window 1000 of Fig. 10), said dialog window being divided into sub-windows for displaying present status of the execution of the command on each of the computer systems (page 17, line

AUS920010905US1

24 to page 18, line 19 and “waiting” sub-window 1005, “working” sub-window 1010, “successful” sub-window 1015 and “failed” sub-window 1020 of Fig. 10); and displaying the status of the execution of the command on each of the computer systems within a proper sub-window (page 17, line 28 to page 18, line 19).

The invention, as claimed in Claim 13, provides a computer program product on a computer readable medium for displaying an execution status of a command sent to a plurality of computer systems on a network for execution. The computer program product comprises: code for displaying a dialog window (page 17, lines 9 - 16 and execution progress window 1000 of Fig. 10), said dialog window being divided into sub-windows for displaying present status of the execution of the command on each of the computer systems (page 17, line 24 to page 18, line 19 and “waiting” sub-window 1005, “working” sub-window 1010, “successful” sub-window 1015 and “failed” sub-window 1020 of Fig. 10); and code for displaying the status of the execution of the command on each of the computer systems within the proper sub-window (page 17, line 28 to page 18, line 19). The code means of the claim are the steps outlined on page 23, line 15 to page 25, line 8 as well as Fig. 12.

The invention, as claimed in Claim 25, provides an apparatus for displaying an execution status of a command sent to a plurality of computer systems on a network for execution. The apparatus comprises: means for displaying a dialog window (page 17, lines 9 - 16 and execution progress window 1000 of Fig. 10), said dialog window being divided into sub-windows for displaying present status of the execution of the command on each of the computer systems (page 17, line 24 to page 18, line 19 and “waiting” sub-window 1005, “working” sub-window 1010, “successful” sub-window 1015 and “failed” sub-window 1020 of Fig. 10); and means for displaying the status of the execution of the command on each of the computer systems within the proper sub-window (page 17, line 28 to page 18, line 19). The means of the claim are

the steps outlined on page 23, line 15 to page 25, line 8 as well as Fig. 12 when executed by processor 202, 204 of Fig. 2 or 302 of Fig. 3.

The invention, as claimed in Claim 37, provides a method of displaying an execution status of a command that is being executed by a plurality of computer systems on a network on which different system management software utilities having different command structures are running. The method comprises the steps of: enabling a user to enter the command in a common interface, the command being either a request to start execution of another command or to stop execution of the other command, the common interface translating the command into the different command structures (page 13, lines 16 – 21 and box 606 of Fig. 6); enabling a user to send the command to the plurality of the computer systems (page 14, lines 1 – 28 and slider 710 and box 720 of Fig. 7); enabling a user to indicate whether or not the execution of the command is to be monitored (page 15, lines 4 – 8 and box 740 of Fig. 4) ; displaying, if the execution of the command is to be monitored, a dialog window (page 17, lines 9 - 16 and execution progress window 1000 of Fig. 10) that is divided into a waiting, working, successful and failed sub-windows for displaying present status of the execution of the command on each of the computer systems executing the command (page 17, line 24 to page 18, line 19 and “waiting” sub-window 1005, “working” sub-window 1010, “successful” sub-window 1015 and “failed” sub-window 1020 of Fig. 10); and displaying the status of the execution of the command on each of the computer systems within a proper sub-window (page 17, line 28 to page 18, line 19).

(vi)

Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

Whether Claims 1 – 8, 13 – 20, 25 - 32 and 37 were properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Joyce et al. in view of Ahmed et al.

Whether Claims 9, 21 and 33 were properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Joyce et al. in view of Ahmed et al. and further in view of Kimura et al.

Whether Claims 10 – 12, 22 – 24 and 34 - 36 were properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Joyce et al. in view of Ahmed et al. and Kimura et al. and further in view of Darland et al.

(vii)

Arguments

Whether Claims 1 – 8, 13 – 20, 25 - 32 and 37 were properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Joyce et al. in view of Ahmed et al.

In considering a Section §103 rejection, the subject matter of the claim “as a whole” must be considered and analyzed. In the analysis, it is necessary that the scope and contents of the prior art and differences between the art and the claimed invention be determined. *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1 (1966).

Claims 1, 13, 25 and 37

In the Examiner’s Answer Brief of August 03, 2006, the Examiner admitted that Joyce et al. do not teach the window being divided into sub-windows for displaying present status of the execution of the command on each of the computer systems. However, the Examiner asserted that Ahmed et al. (US Patent No. 6,647,432) discloses: “Windowing software technology is applied where it is important for an operator to display and interact with multiple programs executing concurrently in a computer system comprising one or more interconnected workstations.” Therefore, the Examiner concluded it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Joyce et al. with those of Ahmed et al. to arrive at the claimed invention.

Joyce et al. purport to teach an extensible, distributed monitoring system for monitoring process interactions in a distributed application system. In accordance with the teachings of Joyce et al., the extensible, distributed monitoring system uses a multilingual inter-process communication (IPC) facility, a window system, a hierarchical graphics package, an interactive graphics editor and a distributed monitoring system to provide means for monitoring the interaction of the processes.

The IPC facility is used to facilitate exchanges of messages among the processes (see Fig. 3). The graphics package provides routines for creating and manipulating pictures and the graphics editor facilitates the creation of pictures that can be used to represent specific states of an executing distributed program. The window system enables a system of processes spanning multiple machines to be observed and controlled from a workstation (see Section 2.1).

The exchanges of messages among the processes may be monitored through traces that can be either textual or graphical. A trace is a depiction of communication events occurring in the distributed system. A textual trace reports each event in an event stream by including the name of a process that initiates the event, the event type, the name of the process that is the subject of the event and if the event is a message, the content of the message (see Section 3.1). A graphical trace is an animated graphical view of an event stream. Whenever an event is received, a picture that represents the current state of the inter-process communication is updated (see Section 3.2). This results in providing to a user an animated graphical view of an event stream, such as that shown in Fig. 7.

Joyce et al. further disclose that processes can be monitorable or unmonitorable. Processes under development are monitorable while processes not under development (i.e., system processes and application processes) are not monitorable (see section 2.3.1).

When a monitorable process generates an event that may have an effect outside of that process, the event is said to be monitorable. A monitorable event

AUS920010905US1

occurs when a process: (1) enters or leaves a system; (2) creates or kills a process; (3) searches for another process to acquire its process identifier; (4) sends, forwards, receives and replies to a message as well as (5) when any one of those operations fails.

When an event is about to occur in a monitorable process, a message containing monitoring information is conveyed to a channel to be displayed on a console. At that point, the application process that is to generate the event is blocked. The application process will remain blocked until the channel replies to the message. Since the application process is blocked until a reply is received, the event cannot occur until then. In addition, no messages from other application processes can be received by the channel.

In instances where a controller is used, however, other messages from other application processes may be received while a reply to a previous message has not yet been sent.

A controller is a monitoring process that is logically situated between a channel and a console. When a controller is used, all channels forward their monitoring messages to the controller. The controller can then postpone replying to a monitoring message thereby suspending the application process that generated the event (see section 2.3.3).

Joyce et al. then proceed to provide a banking example on page 131. In the example, personal bank accounts are held at geographically separated branches of the bank to form a distributed system. Transactions are initiated at personal banking machines that communicate with a local branch of the bank. If an account involved in a transaction is held at the local branch, then the transaction is handled by the local branch; otherwise, the transaction is forwarded to the branch where the account is maintained. The interactions between any two the branches of the bank are monitored (see bottom of page 131).

Thus, Joyce et al. disclose a monitoring system that supports the observation and control of message passing within a distributed application system that consists of a set of concurrently executing processes.

But Joyce et al. do not teach, show or suggest ***displaying the status of a command that is being executed on the plurality of computer systems*** as asserted by the Examiner.

It is important to note that, in the present invention, the command is sent to a plurality of computer systems (see the pre-amble of the claims) for execution.

In MPEP 2111.02, it is stated that:

A claim preamble has the import that the claim as a whole suggests for it." *Bell Communications Research, Inc. v. Vitalink Communications Corp.*, 55 F.3d 615, 620, 34 USPQ2d 1816, 1820 (Fed. Cir. 1995). "If the claim preamble, when read in the context of the entire claim, recites limitations of the claim, or, *if the claim preamble is 'necessary to give life, meaning, and vitality' to the claim, then the claim preamble should be construed as if in the balance of the claim.*" *Pitney Bowes, Inc. v. Hewlett-Packard Co.*, 182 F.3d 1298, 1305, 51 USPQ2d 1161, 1165-66 (Fed. Cir. 1999). See also *Jansen v. Rexall Sundown, Inc.*, 342 F.3d 1329, 1333, 68 USPQ2d 1154, 1158 (Fed. Cir. 2003)(In considering the effect of the preamble in a claim directed to a method of treating or preventing pernicious anemia in humans by administering a certain vitamin preparation to "a human in need thereof," the court held that the claims' recitation of a patient or a human "in need" gives life and meaning to the preamble's statement of purpose.). *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951) (A preamble reciting "An abrasive article" was deemed essential to point out the invention defined by claims to an article comprising abrasive grains and a hardened binder and the process of making it.

The court stated "it is only by that phrase that it can be known that the subject matter defined by the claims is comprised as an abrasive article. Every union of substances capable *inter alia* of use as abrasive grains and a binder is not an 'abrasive article.'" Therefore, the preamble served to further define the structure of the article produced.). (Emphasis added.)

In this case, the first element of the claim reads: ***displaying a dialog window, said dialog window being divided into sub-windows for displaying present status of the execution of the command on each of the computer systems***. Thus, each computer system is executing the command sent to it (this is reinforced by the preamble) and the status of the execution of the command (as it is being executed by each of the computer systems) is displayed on a plurality of sub-windows (see the second element of the claim).

By contrast, Joyce et al. disclose sending one command to one computer system and if during the execution of the command on the computer system there is interaction between an executing process and another process or between the computer system (executing the command) and another computer system, that interaction is displayed.

Displaying interactions between two processes or between two computer systems in response to having a command be executed by one of the computer systems is quite differently from sending a command to two or more computer systems and displaying the status of the execution of the command on each one of the computer systems.

Thus supposing, arguendo, that the Examiner is correct in asserting that Ahmed et al. disclose the windowing software technology that allows for displaying execution of multiple programs executing concurrently in a computer system, combining the teachings of Joyce et al. with those of Ahmed et al. does not show ***displaying a dialog window, said dialog window being divided into sub-windows for displaying present status of the execution of the***

command (which was sent to each one of a plurality of computer systems) on each of the computer systems; and displaying the status of the execution of the command on each of the computer systems within a proper sub-window as claimed.

Claims 2, 14 and 26

Claims 2, 14 and 26 include the limitations “wherein said sub-windows include a “waiting” sub-window, a “working” sub-window and a “completed” sub-window.”

The Examiner asserted that on page 133, line 41 to page 134, line 6, Joyce et al. teach that when the status of a machine changes, the display is changed to reflect the new status. Therefore, the Examiner concluded, although Joyce et al. do not explicitly teach displaying the names of the computer systems in the sub-windows in accordance with the status of the execution of the command on the computer systems, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Joyce et al.’s method by placing the machine name icons into separate window based on their current state of waiting, receiving or finished.

However, it should be noted that the display is changed to reflect a new status of a message transfer between two processes which results in a succession of images being displayed. This is what allows for the animated graphical view of the event stream. Consequently, no more than one window is used to display the statuses of message transfers among the processes.

Hence, even if the Examiner was correct in asserting that the teachings of Joyce et al. could be modified to show the machine name icons into separate window based on their current state of waiting, receiving or finished, the resulting modification of the teachings of Joyce et al. would not teach the step of **displaying a dialog window being divided into sub-windows *wherein said sub-windows include a “waiting” sub-window, a “working” sub-window and a “completed” sub-window*** for displaying present status of the

AUS920010905US1

execution of the command on each of the computer systems as in the claimed invention.

Therefore, Appellants submit that the claims are not obvious by the teachings of the applied references.

Claims 4, 16 and 28

Claims 4, 16 and 28 include the limitations “wherein when the command begins to execute on a computer system, the name of the computer system is moved from the “waiting” sub-window to the “working” sub-window.”

In rejecting the instant claims, the Examiner used the same rational used to reject Claims 2, 14 and 26. Appellants respectfully disagree.

Neither Joyce et al. nor Ahmed et al. teach, show or so much as suggest the use of “**waiting**” sub-window and “**working**” sub-window much less the step of moving the name of a computer system from the “waiting” sub-window to the “working” sub-window when the command begins to execute on the computer system.

Thus, Appellants submit that Claims 4, 16 and 28 are not obvious by the teachings of the applied references.

Claims 5, 17 and 29

Claims 5, 17 and 29 include the limitations “wherein when the command has finished executing on a computer, the name of the computer is moved from the “working” sub-window to the “completed” sub-window.”

Again, in rejecting the instant claims, the Examiner used the same rational used to reject Claims 2, 14 and 26. Again, Appellants respectfully disagree.

Neither Joyce et al. nor Ahmed et al. teach, show or so much as suggest the use of “**working**” sub-window and “**completed**” sub-window much less the step of moving the name of a computer system from the “working” sub-window to the “completed” sub-window when the command has finished to execute on the computer system.

AUS920010905US1

Thus, Appellants submit that Claims 5, 17 and 29 are not obvious by the teachings of the applied references and request reversal of the rejection.

Claims 6, 18 and 30

Claims 6, 18 and 30 include the limitations “wherein the “completed” sub-window is further divided into a “successful” sub-window and a “failed” sub-window.”

Once more, the Examiner used the same rational used to reject Claims 2, 14 and 26 to reject the present claims. Once more, Appellants respectfully disagree.

Neither Joyce et al. nor Ahmed et al. teach, show or so much as suggest the use of a “**completed**” window being sub-divided into a “**successful**” sub-window and “**failed**” sub-window.

Thus, Appellants submit that Claims 6, 18 and 30 are not obvious by the teachings of the applied references and request reversal of the rejection.

Claims 7, 19 and 31

Claims 7, 19 and 31 include the limitations “wherein the names of the computer systems that have successfully completed the execution of the command are displayed in the “successful” sub-window.”

The Examiner rejected the instant claims under the same rational as the rejection of Claims 2, 14 and 26. Appellants continue to respectfully disagree.

As discussed above, neither Joyce et al. nor Ahmed et al. teach, show or so much as suggest the use of a “**completed**” window being sub-divided into a “**successful**” sub-window and “**failed**” sub-window. Consequently, the combination of their teachings cannot include the teachings of **displaying the names of the computer systems that have successfully completed the execution of the command in the “successful” sub-window** as claimed.

Thus, Appellants submit that Claims 7, 19 and 31 are not obvious by the teachings of the applied references and request reversal of the rejection.

Claims 8, 20 and 32

Claims 8, 20 and 32 include the limitations “wherein the names of the computer systems that have not successfully completed the execution of the command are displayed in the “failed” sub-window.”

The Examiner rejected the instant claims under the same rational as the rejection of Claims 2, 14 and 26. Appellants respectfully disagree.

As mentioned above, neither Joyce et al. nor Ahmed et al. teach, show or so much as suggest the use of a “**completed**” window being sub-divided into a “**successful**” sub-window and “**failed**” sub-window. Consequently, the combination of their teachings cannot include the teachings of **displaying the names of the computer systems that have not successfully completed the execution of the command in the “failed” sub-window** as claimed.

Thus, Appellants submit that Claims 8, 20 and 32 are not obvious by the teachings of the applied references and request reversal of the rejection.

Whether Claims 9, 21 and 33 were properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Joyce et al. in view of Ahmed et al. and further in view of Kimura et al.

Claims 9, 21 and 33 include the limitations “wherein the names of the computer systems that have not successfully completed the execution of the command are displayed in red in the “failed” sub-window.”

The Examiner admitted that neither Joyce et al. nor Ahmed et al. disclose that the names of the computer systems are displayed in red in the “failed” sub-window. However, the Examiner asserted that in col. 9, lines 56 – 60 Kimura et al. teach that a color such as red can be used to denote an error condition in a display.

Firstly, whether or not “Kimura et al. teach that a color such as red can be used to denote an error condition in a display” is irrelevant. The claims specifically include the limitations “the names of the computer systems that have

AUS920010905US1

not successfully completed the execution of the command are displayed in red in the “failed” sub-window.” They do not include the limitations of using a color such as red to denote an error condition.

Secondly, Appellants would like to point out that in col. 9, lines 56 – 60 Kimura et al. disclose that when an error occurs in a video/audio device shown on a display, the **background color** is changed from white to a warning color, such as red flickers.

Kimura et al. do not teach displaying **the names of the computer systems that have not successfully completed the execution of the command in red in the “failed” sub-window.**

Thirdly, Kimura et al. purport to teach an error monitoring system for video/audio devices. According to the teachings of Kimura et al., the system is comprised of a processing unit for executing an error monitoring process by detecting errors occurring in the video/audio devices, a communication unit connecting the video/audio devices to the processing unit, and a display unit connected to the processing unit to simultaneously display on a common display plane a plurality of images indicating the video/audio devices and to give an error indication in accordance with a result of the error monitoring process by the processing unit.

Thus, there is no reason for anyone to combine the teachings of Kimura et al. with those of Joyce et al. and Ahmed et al. absent some teaching or suggestion to do so.

In *In re Fritch*, 972 F.2d 1260, 23 USPQ 2d 1780, 1783–84 (Fed. Cir. 1992), the Court ruled that “[o]bviousness cannot be established by combining the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention, absent some teaching or suggestion supporting the combination. Under section 103, teachings of references can be combined *only* if there is some suggestion or incentive to do so.” (quoting *ACS Hosp. Systems, Inc. v. Montefiore Hosp.*, 732 F.2d 1572, 1577, 221 USPQ 929, 933 (Fed. Cir. 1984)). . . . The mere fact that the prior art may be modified in the manner suggested by the Examiner does not

AUS920010905US1

make the modification obvious unless the prior art suggested the desirability of the modification.

As mentioned above, the teachings of Joyce et al. are directed toward an extensible, distributed monitoring system for monitoring a distributed application system while those of Ahmed et al. are directed toward a distributed framework for inter-task communication between workstation applications. By contrast, the teachings of Kimura et al. are directed toward an error monitoring system for video/audio devices.

There is not any language in the disclosure of Joyce et al., the one of Ahmed et al. or of Kimura et al. suggesting or teaching combining the teachings of the references together.

Consequently, Appellants submit that the Examiner has impermissibly combined the teachings of Joyce et al. and Ahmed et al. with those of Kimura et al. in a quest to arrive at the claimed invention. Hence the claims are not patentable over the applied references.

Hence, Appellants submit that the claims are not obvious by the teachings of the applied references.

Whether Claims 10 – 12, 22 – 24 and 34 - 36 were properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Joyce et al. in view of Ahmed et al. and Kimura et al. and further in view of Darland et al.

Claims 10, 22 and 34

Claims 10, 22 and 34 include the limitations “wherein when the displayed name of a computer system is selected further information about the status of the command executing on the computer system is displayed.”

The Examiner, as in the case of the previous dependent claims, admitted that the previously applied references do not teach the step of displaying further information about the status of the command executing on the computer system when the displayed of a computer system is selected. However, the Examiner

AUS920010905US1

asserted that Darland et al. teach in col. 11, lines 11, 12 and 18 – 22 that additional operating information about an item can be obtained by selecting that item.

Firstly, whether additional operating information about an item can be obtained by selecting that item is irrelevant since the claimed limitations specifically state that when the displayed name of a computer system is selected **further information about the status of the command executing on the computer system is displayed.**

Secondly, Darland et al. disclose in col. 11, lines 6 – 37:

The following procedure is used to access the Single Operator display:

1. The user points to the terminal icon for the operator he wishes to display.
2. The user holds the SHIFT key of the

If computer and clicks the mouse button on the terminal icon. this is done for a terminal which is shown as OFFLINE or for an operator who is not presently signed on to a job, the following message is provided:

The monitoring system displays the Single Operator display screen, as shown in FIG. 9. When the display appears, the various data fields begin to display information about the operator extracted from the Voicelink system. Next, the operator's bar chart fills in to show the operator's calling results across six selected release codes. Finally, the operator's productivity chart updates to show the use of the operator's time on the system.

It is noted that the Overview screen can show an operator active (indicated by the letter "A" in the terminal icon) on a job who has quit that job since the last update. When this happens, the computer monitor provides the message:

The user can click the mouse button on the "OK" option to return to the Overview display and select another operator.

Thus, in the passages cited by the Examiner, Darland et al. disclose a method of accessing a display. However, Darland et al. do not teach, show or so much as suggest the step of displaying **further information about the status of the command** executing on the computer system when the name of a computer system is selected.

Consequently, combining the teachings of Joyce et al., Ahmed et al. and Kimura et al. with those of Darland et al. does not teach the claimed invention.

Claims 11, 23 and 35

Claims 11, 23 and 35 include the limitations "wherein if the selected computer system is displayed in the failed sub-window, a reason for the unsuccessful completion of the execution of the command is displayed."

In this case, the Examiner asserted that Kimura et al. further disclose in col. 10, lines 9 – 18 that when an error condition occurs, an error code and an error message can be displayed.

Appellants would like to point out that the claimed invention specifically call for displaying a reason for the unsuccessful completion of the execution of the command if the selected computer system is displayed in the failed sub-window.

Therefore, even if the Examiner were correct in asserting that Kimura et al. disclose that when an error condition occurs, an error code and an error message can be displayed, the combination of the teachings of Joyce et al.,

AUS920010905US1

Ahmed et al., Kimura et al. and Darland et al. would still not teach the claimed invention.

Hence, Appellants submit that the claims are not obvious by the teachings of the applied references.

Claims 12, 24 and 36

Claims 12, 24 and 36 include the limitations “wherein if the selected computer system is displayed in the executing sub-window, a real-time progress of the execution of the command is displayed.”

The Examiner asserted that Darland et al. further disclose that the additional operating information obtained by selecting the item can include a real-time progress indicator in col. 11, lines 2 and 24 – 26.

Again, Appellants would like to point out that the claimed invention specifically state that a real-time progress of the execution of the command is displayed if the selected computer system is displayed in the executing sub-window.

Therefore, even if the Examiner were correct in asserting that Darland et al. further disclose that the additional operating information obtained by selecting the item can include a real-time progress indicator, the combination of the teachings of Joyce et al., Ahmed et al., Kimura et al. and Darland et al. would still not teach the claimed invention.

Hence, Appellants submit that the claims are not obvious by the teachings of the applied references.

Based on the above-proffered arguments, Appellants respectfully request reversal of the rejection of the claims in the Application.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Volel Emile/ Registration No. 39,969
Volel Emile
Attorney for Appellants
(512) 306 - 7969

(viii)
Claims Appendix

1. (Previously presented) A method of displaying an execution status of a command, said command being sent to a plurality of computer systems on a network for execution, said method comprising the steps of:

displaying a dialog window, said dialog window being divided into sub-windows for displaying present status of the execution of the command on each of the computer systems; and

displaying the status of the execution of the command on each of the computer systems within a proper sub-window.
2. (Original) The method of Claim 1 wherein said sub-windows include a “waiting” sub-window, a “working” sub-window and a “completed” sub-window.
3. (Original) The method of Claim 2 wherein the step of displaying the status of the execution of the command includes displaying the names of the computer systems in the sub-windows in accordance with the status of the execution of the command on the computer systems.
4. (Original) The method of Claim 3 wherein when the command begins to execute on a computer system, the name of the computer system is moved from the “waiting” sub-window to the “working” sub-window.
5. (Original) The method of Claim 4 wherein when the command has finished executing on a computer, the name of the computer is moved from the “working” sub-window to the “completed” sub-window.

6. (Original) The method of Claim 5 wherein the “completed” sub-window is further divided into a “successful” sub-window and a “failed” sub-window.
7. (Original) The method of Claim 6 wherein the names of the computer systems that have successfully completed the execution of the command are displayed in the “successful” sub-window.
8. (Previously presented) The method of Claim 7 wherein the names of the computer systems that have not successfully completed the execution of the command are displayed in the “failed” sub-window.
9. (Previously presented) The method of Claim 8 wherein the names of the computer systems that have not successfully completed the execution of the command are displayed in red in the “failed” sub-window.
10. (Original) The method of Claim 9 wherein when the displayed name of a computer system is selected further information about the status of the command executing on the computer system is displayed.
11. (Original) The method of Claim 10 wherein if the selected computer system is displayed in the failed sub-window, a reason for the unsuccessful completion of the execution of the command is displayed.
12. (Previously presented) The method of Claim 11 wherein if the selected computer system is displayed in the executing sub-window, a real-time progress of the execution of the command is displayed.
13. (Previously presented) A computer program product on a computer readable medium for displaying an execution status of a command, said

AUS920010905US1

command being sent to a plurality of computer systems on a network for execution, said computer program product comprising:

code for displaying a dialog window, said dialog window being divided into sub-windows for displaying present status of the execution of the command on each of the computer systems; and

code for displaying the status of the execution of the command on each of the computer systems within the proper sub-window.

14. (Original) The computer program product of Claim 13 wherein said sub-windows include a “waiting” sub-window, a “working” sub-window and a “completed” sub-window.
15. (Original) The computer program product of Claim 14 wherein the code for displaying the status of the execution of the command includes code for displaying the names of the computer systems in the sub-windows in accordance with the status of the execution of the command on the computer systems.
16. (Original) The computer program product of Claim 15 wherein when the command begins to execute on a computer system, the name of the computer system is moved from the “waiting” sub-window to the “working” sub-window.
17. (Original) The computer program product of Claim 16 wherein when the command has finished executing on a computer, the name of the computer is moved from the “working” sub-window to the “completed” sub-window.

18. (Original) The computer program product of Claim 17 wherein the “completed” sub-window is further divided into a “successful” sub-window and a “failed” sub-window.
19. (Original) The computer program product of Claim 18 wherein the names of the computer systems that have successfully completed the execution of the command are displayed in the “successful” sub-window.
20. (Previously presented) The computer program product of Claim 19 wherein the names of the computer systems that have not successfully completed the execution of the command are displayed in the “failed” sub-window.
21. (Previously presented) The computer program product of Claim 20 wherein the names of the computer systems that have not successfully completed the execution of the command are displayed in red in the “failed” sub-window.
22. (Original) The computer program product of Claim 21 wherein when the displayed name of a computer system is selected further information about the status of the command executing on the computer system is displayed.
23. (Original) The computer program product of Claim 22 wherein if the selected computer system is displayed in the failed sub-window, a reason for the unsuccessful completion of the execution of the command is displayed.
24. (Previously presented) The computer program product of Claim 23 wherein if the selected computer system is displayed in the executing sub-

window, a real-time progress of the execution of the command is displayed.

25. (Previously presented) An apparatus for displaying an execution status of a command, said command being sent to a plurality of computer systems on a network for execution, said apparatus comprising:

means for displaying a dialog window, said dialog window being divided into sub-windows for displaying present status of the execution of the command on each of the computer systems; and

means for displaying the status of the execution of the command on each of the computer systems within the proper sub-window.

26. (Original) The apparatus of Claim 25 wherein said sub-windows include a “waiting” sub-window, a “working” sub-window and a “completed” sub-window.

27. (Original) The apparatus of Claim 26 wherein the means for displaying the status of the execution of the command includes means for displaying the names of the computer systems in the sub-windows in accordance with the status of the execution of the command on the computer systems.

28. (Original) The apparatus of Claim 27 wherein when the command begins to execute on a computer system, the name of the computer system is moved from the “waiting” sub-window to the “working” sub-window.

29. (Original) The apparatus of Claim 28 wherein when the command has finished executing on a computer, the name of the computer is moved from the “working” sub-window to the “completed” sub-window.

30. (Original) The apparatus of Claim 29 wherein the “completed” sub-window is further divided into a “successful” sub-window and a “failed” sub-window.
31. (Original) The apparatus of Claim 30 wherein the names of the computer systems that have successfully completed the execution of the command are displayed in the “successful” sub-window.
32. (Previously presented) The apparatus of Claim 31 wherein the names of the computer systems that have not successfully completed the execution of the command are displayed in the “failed” sub-window.
33. (Previously presented) The apparatus of Claim 32 wherein the names of the computer systems that have not successfully completed the execution of the command are displayed in red in the “failed” sub-window.
34. (Original) The apparatus of Claim 33 wherein when the displayed name of a computer system is selected further information about the status of the command executing on the computer system is displayed.
35. (Original) The apparatus of Claim 34 wherein if the selected computer system is displayed in the failed sub-window, a reason for the unsuccessful completion of the execution of the command is displayed.
36. (Previously presented) The apparatus of Claim 35 wherein if the selected computer system is displayed in the executing sub-window, a real-time progress of the execution of the command is displayed.

37. (Previously presented) A method of displaying an execution status of a command, the command being executed by a plurality of computer systems on a network, the computer systems running different system management software utilities having different command structures, the method comprising the steps of:

enabling a user to enter the command in a common interface, the command being either a request to start execution of another command or to stop execution of the other command, the common interface translating the command into the different command structures;

enabling a user to send the command to the plurality of the computer systems;

enabling a user to indicate whether or not the execution of the command is to be monitored;

displaying, if the execution of the command is to be monitored, a dialog window that is divided into a waiting, working, successful and failed sub-windows for displaying present status of the execution of the command on each of the computer systems executing the command; and

displaying the status of the execution of the command on each of the computer systems within a proper sub-window.

Appl. No. 09/965,002

Response to Notice of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief dated 01/07/2009

Reply to Office Action of 12/09/2008

(ix)

Evidence Appendix

None.

Appl. No. 09/965,002

Response to Notice of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief dated 01/07/2009

Reply to Office Action of 12/09/2008

(x)

Related Proceedings Appendix

None.